

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 continue to be pending in the application. New claims 27-45 were presented, however the Examiner noted that they were not numbered consecutively and therefore he has now renumbered the claims 27-45 as 26-44. It is assumed that the Examiner has also renumbered the claim dependency of dependent claims 27-34, 36-39 and 40-44.

Claims 1-25 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Toland et al (US 6,268,835).

Claims 26-34 and 40-44 are noted to be allowed.

Claims 38 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Considering the statements made by the Examiner regarding allowable subject matter, at page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states with respect to “independent claim 26, Toland fails to specifically teach among other features, that the rim of the reflector defines a polygonal geometric shape.”

At page 6, the Examiner notes that “Regarding claim 38, Toland fails to specifically teach, among other features that the reflect array pattern is a reflector array pattern corresponding to a substantially hexagonal lattice of reflector antennas.”

Regarding claim 39, he notes that “Toland fails to specifically teach among other features that at least one of the array-fed reflector patterns is an array-fed reflector pattern corresponding to a feed array illuminating a reflector and comprising individual feeds arranged in a hexagonal lattice.”

Regarding claim 40, the Examiner states that "Toland fails to specifically teach, among other features, that the reflector having a reflector surface having a periphery in a shape of a polygon and including rigid support posts located at corner points of the periphery."

Accordingly, Claim 1 is now amended to define each reflector as having a plurality of elongated edges defining a polygonal geometric shape, which is not taught by the Toland reference. Therefore, claim 1 is now deemed to be in condition for allowance along with dependent claims 2-16 which depend directly or ultimately from independent claim 1.

Claim 17 is also now amended to recite a parabolic reflector element having a polygonal shape and thus is also deemed to be in condition for allowance along with dependent claims 18-25, which depend directly from independent claim 17.

Independent claim 35 is now amended to also recite that the array pattern generated by a lattice of four more reflector elements having a polygonal geometric peripheral shape. Since this feature is not taught by the Toland reference, claim 35 is therefore deemed to be in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 36-39 are deemed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 35.

Claims 40-44 are noted to be allowed by virtue of the reflector surface having a periphery in the shape of a polygon.

Accordingly, all the claims now present in the application are deemed to be in condition for allowance and therefore further and favorable action is requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the present request for an interference, he is respectfully requested to direct these to the undersigned, at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: William L. Gates
William L. Gates, Reg. No. 20,848

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

WLG/fjl